

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 12, 18 and 30 have been amended. No new matter is introduced herein. Of pending claims 1-30, claims 1-11 and 21-29 have been withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 30 have been amended to recite that the graphical user interface (GUI) guides a user through a predetermined protocol for multiple recording locations. Claims 12 and 30 have also been amended to include the feature that the GUI displays multiple waveforms corresponding to heart sounds signals (respective sequence of bodily sound signals, claim 30)) for the respective multiple recording locations in a manner such that the multiple waveforms can be visually correlated. No new matter is introduced herein. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, at paragraphs [0029-0032]; and Fig. 3 of the subject specification.

In the Office Action Summary at page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that claims 1-11 and 26-29 are withdrawn. Applicant notes that claims 21-25 are also withdrawn. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledges that claims 1-11 and 21-29 are withdrawn.

The Drawings were objected to as being handwritten and difficult to understand. Formal/replacement drawings are submitted herewith. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the Drawings be withdrawn.

Claim 18 was objected to because it includes a typographical error. Claim 18 has been corrected accordingly. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 18 be withdrawn.

Claims 12-13, 15-17, 19 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bredezen et al. (US 5,213,108). It is respectfully submitted that this ground for rejection is overcome for the reason set forth below.

In particular, Bredezen et al. do not disclose or suggest:

... a graphical user interface (GUI) to guide a user through a predetermined protocol for multiple recording locations...

... the GUI displays multiple waveforms corresponding to heart sound signals for the respective multiple recording locations in a manner such that the multiple waveforms can be visually correlated...

as required by claim 12 or

... a graphical user interface (GUI) to guide a user through a predetermined protocol for multiple recording locations to obtain a respective sequence of bodily sound signals...

... the GUI displays multiple waveforms corresponding to the respective sequence of bodily sound signals in a manner such that the multiple waveforms can be visually correlated...

as required by claim 30.

Bredesen et al. disclose, in Fig. 1, a stethoscope for capturing and storing heart sounds at six locations, where a "specific order of auscultation" is followed based on observing sternum diagram 132 (Col. 12, lines 30-57). Sternum diagram 132, shown in Fig. 5, is used to indicate from what point on the body waveform data is to be taken or from what point on the body a saved body sound was previously taken (Col. 12, lines 21-45). The heart sound data is analyzed to detect various heart sounds and to provide a diagnosis of abnormalities (Abstract and Figs. 8A-8H).

Bredesen et al., however, do not disclose or suggest a GUI that displays multiple waveforms corresponding to heart sound signals for respective multiple recording locations in a manner such that the multiple waveforms can be visually correlated, as required by claim 12, or a GUI that displays multiple waveforms corresponding to a respective sequence of bodily sound signals in a manner such that the multiple waveforms can be visually correlated, as required by claim 30. Bredesen et al., instead, display only one waveform at a time and, thus, cannot teach the display of multiple waveforms displayed in a manner that allows visual correlation.

The subject invention provides advantages neither disclosed or suggested by Bredesen et al. According to claims 12 and 30, multiple waveforms from different recording locations may be displayed and visually compared to one another. In this manner, a user may determine whether a pattern of heart beats (or patterns of other bodily sounds) for one recording location is properly reflected in another recording location. This information may be used, for example, to re-record a signal for a recording location, as described at paragraph [0030] of the subject specification. The display of multiple visually correlated waveforms may

also be used to determine whether it may be desirable to record further bodily sound signals with another predetermined protocol. For example, a user may view an anomaly in a waveform for a recording location, where the anomaly may be associated with a particular disease. The user may further record bodily sound signals according to a different predetermined protocol, where the different protocol may be used to associate or dissociate the anomaly with the disease. Bredesen et al., in contrast, allow a user to visually inspect one waveform at a time before storing the waveform (Col. 12, line 64-Col. 13, line 2). Thus, Bredesen et al. do not include all of the features or the advantages of claims 12 or 30.

Because Bredesen et al. do not disclose all of the features of claims 12 or 30, claims 12 and 30 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bredesen et al. Because claims 13, 15-17 and 19 include all of the features of claim 12 from which they depend, claims 13, 15-17 and 19 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bredesen et al.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bredesen et al. Claim 14, however, includes all of the features of claim 12 from which it depends. Accordingly, claim 14 is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bredesen et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 12.

Claims 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bredesen et al. in view of Nova et al. (US 6,334,070). Claims 18 and 20, however, include all of the features of claim 12 from which they depend and are patentable over Bredesen et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 12.

Nova et al. do not supply the deficiencies of Bredesen et al. because they do not disclose or suggest, a GUI that displays multiple waveforms corresponding to heart sound signals for respective multiple recording locations in a manner such that the multiple waveforms can be visually correlated, as required by claim 12.

Nova et al. disclose, in Figs. 1A and 1B, an automated external defibrillator (AED) 10 that guides a rescuer with minimal training through the application of CPR and defibrillation therapy to a patient. AED 10 guides the user through a series of visual instructions on liquid crystal display 14 and provides additional aural instructions via speaker 18. (Col. 3, lines 38-57 of Nova et al.) Nova et al., however, do not disclose or suggest a GUI that displays multiple

waveforms corresponding to heart sound signals for respective multiple recording locations in a manner such that the multiple waveforms can be visually correlated, as required by claim 12. Nova et al. do not display waveforms and, thus, cannot teach that multiple visually correlated waveforms corresponding to heart sound signals are displayed.

The cited art taken singularly or in combination do not disclose or suggest the features of claim 12. Accordingly, claims 18 and 20, which include all of the features of claim 12 from which they depend, are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bredesen et al. in view of Nova et al.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 12-20 and 30.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549
Deborah M. Grove, Agent No. 61,091
Attorney/Patent Agent for Applicant

Dated: March 10, 2008

KNN/DMG/ccr/pb

PB_H:\NRPORTBL\RP\PCBOCELLA\261802_1.DOC